



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Aristotle's Constitution of Athens. A Revised Text, with an Introduction, Critical and Explanatory Notes, Testimonia and Indices. By JOHN EDWIN SANDYS, Litt. D., etc. London and New York, Macmillan & Co., 1893. Pp. lxxx, 302. 15s.

Readers of the London *Times* were startled, on the morning of January 19, 1891, by the announcement of the discovery, and prospective publication by the British Museum, of Aristotle's long-lost treatise on the Athenian Commonwealth. Eleven days later the *editio princeps* appeared, prepared by Mr. F. G. Kenyon. With some superficial blemishes, due in large part to haste in publication, the edition gave evidence of the editor's extraordinary skill in deciphering the crabbed cursive hands of the papyrus, and of the general soundness of his judgments on the historical questions raised for the first time by the recovery of the lost work. To the promptness of the authorities of the British Museum, in happy contrast with the delays of some other like institutions on the Continent, the world of scholarship owes no slight debt. But for that, and for the success of most of Mr. Kenyon's original readings, one may safely say we might even now be waiting for a satisfactory edition of the text.

The announcement made within a few weeks after the appearance of Mr. Kenyon's book, that Dr. Sandys, who was among the first to greet the discovery, was preparing a critical and explanatory edition, was received with much satisfaction by all scholars who knew his broad and graceful scholarship, already tested in the fields of Athenian institutions and of Aristotelian criticism. This promised edition is now before us. The preface is dated December 27, 1892, the year following the first issue of the work. That within so brief a space of time a treatise on the whole so complete, comprehensive and sound could have appeared is not only most creditable to the editor's ability, but is an interesting indication of the vigorous vitality, splendid reach and vast resources of the classical scholarship of to-day. In a period of less than two years an important classic has been recovered; has been published in at least five independent and noteworthy critical editions; has been translated into nearly all the languages of Europe; a bulky literature of explanation and illustration has sprung up relating to it; it has been explored from all possible points of view, from those of language, style, subject-matter, in its relation to history, antiquities, palaeography. Each latest writer has had the benefit of the results reached by his predecessors. But as matters have by no means been brought to a definite conclusion, each investigator has thus far shared something of the spirit of the original explorer, and has always been called upon to exercise his judgment and critical faculty in deciding between variant views and propositions. Much foolishness has been written, and at times "the wild asses of philology" have been in evidence, but

in the main there has been distinct progress, both in the construction and in the explanation of the text, and unanimity has finally been reached on numerous points on which, until recently, there had been wide differences of opinion. Some fundamental problems have been solved. The question whether there are, between the Politics of Aristotle and the Constitution, differences so radical—in the matter of language, style, subject-matter and sentiments—as to make common authorship impossible, has been answered in the negative by scholars who have separately examined the topics included in such an enquiry. An absolute consensus of opinion has not been reached on all points, and probably will never be reached. On the matter of the authorship, the radical and the conservative views have found abundant expression, and the case has been strongly put for both sides. That there should be a general trend of opinion in favor of Aristotelian authorship is more significant now than it was a year ago, when many elements of the problem had not yet been taken into consideration.

Next to the *editio princeps*, the edition of Dr. Sandys is the most important contribution to the literature of the Constitution that has yet appeared. And this not by reason of essential originality, though everywhere in it are to be found acute and novel observations and most happy suggestions, but mainly because the author has gathered, with just grasp of the subject, the manifold results of recent study, has tested and weighed them with insight and sobriety, and has given the product in a clear and attractive form. Work more original has been done on the treatise by others—as the emendations and restorations of Blass, Kaibel-Wilamowitz, and several English scholars; the special studies of particular topics by Bauer, Busolt, the Cauers, Diels, Gomperz, Bruno Keil, Köhler, Lipsius, P. Meyer, Newman, Théodore Reinach, Rühl, and others—but nowhere have these special inquiries found a more judicious critic or a happier expounder than in Dr. Sandys. His edition stands alone in the attention paid to matters of verbal criticism—in general, to the details of scholarship as brought to bear on a classic—and to the comparison, with the fresh evidence, of our traditional knowledge of Athenian constitutional history and of legal antiquities: it abounds in illustrative material borrowed mainly from ancient historians, writers on antiquities, grammarians, lexicographers, and from Athenian inscriptions. Aristotle's other works have been abundantly drawn upon. The text has been constructed by the editor after due consideration of the readings proposed, and after repeated examinations of the papyrus itself. The importance of a resort to the papyrus, and the failure of the facsimile in cases of last appeal, are well seen in the changes Blass has been obliged to suggest (October, 1892), after inspecting the papyrus, in the readings proposed in his text-edition (January, 1892). Beneath Dr. Sandys's text, as printed, stand the *variae lectiones* and the *testimonia*. The former, though only a selection from the countless number published, comprise, if I am not mistaken, all the readings proposed in the editions of Kenyon (the third), of Kaibel-Wilamowitz, of Herwerden-Leeuwen, and of Blass, not to speak of ingenious and successful suggestions of many other scholars. The readings of the papyrus, where different from the text, are given in an attractive cursive 'uncial,' which suggests well enough for practical purposes the original forms of the letters. Dr. Sandys is not, however, perfectly consistent in the non-use

of spaces between words thus given in facsimile. The *testimonia* give the full text of all the passages in extant post-Aristotelian literature, thus far identified, that are believed to be taken more or less directly from the original treatise. Dr. Sandys has gathered under this head several passages not previously cited in the connections in which he cites them. The explanatory notes, printed on the same page with the text, are extremely copious, and, in keeping with the universality of the classical scholarship of the present time, cover a large number of topics. At many points the traditional, or the prevalent, views are criticised and corrected: especially valuable to the student are the corrections of Grote. In all these matters a happy proportion has been observed, and controversy has been wisely kept subordinate to positive exposition and elucidation. In an appendix are printed the fragments supposed by Rose and others to have belonged to this book, but not occurring in the recovered portion; here also is found the text of the Heracleidean Excerpts. An excellent *Index Graecitatis* gives us a concordance to the treatise, except that some of the more frequently recurring words are not indexed in full—the omissions are ἀπό, γάρ, δέ, δοκῶ, ἐαυτοῦ, ἐθέλω, εἰμί, εἰς, ἑκάτερος, ἐν, ἐπί, ἐρχομαι, ἕτερος, ἔτος, ἔχω, ἦ, καί, μὲν . . . δέ, μή, μηδέ, μηδεῖς, μήτε, νῦν, οἶδα, ὅταν, ὅτε, ὅτι, οὐ, οὐδέ, οὐδεῖς, οὕτως, οὕτω, some of which are to be regretted. By typographical devices one can distinguish at a glance all words absolutely new, and all words not found in Bonitz's *Index Aristotelicus*. Some of the lexical articles are very full. An English index finally calls attention to proper names, to subjects discussed in the text and notes, as also to the views of many recent writers on the Constitution.

The text is preceded by an introduction of eighty pages, in which, among other topics, the following are treated: the political literature of Greece before the time of Aristotle; political works ascribed to Aristotle; evidence of ancient authorities on the authorship of the *Πολιτεῖαι*; the later literature of the *Πολιτεῖαι*; the Berlin fragments; the British Museum papyrus; date and authorship of the treatise; and the authorities followed in it. A full abstract of its contents, given for the most part in a condensed translation, and an extremely copious conspectus of recent literature—comprising more than one hundred and eighty titles—add greatly to the value of the book. In the closing pages of the introduction the effort is made to bring the subject down to the date of publication. It is worth noting that this material received since the larger part of the book was put into type is mainly supplemental, and only seldom tends actually to correct the original statements of the editor. Finally there are several good cuts, viz. a *πινάκιον*, Athenian coins, heliastic *σύμβολα*, bronze *ψήφοι*, *κλήροι*, etc.

Of the topics discussed in the introduction there are several which have by no means arrived at their final stage. Repeated examination and comparison of the later historical and kindred literature, both in fragments and in complete works, must be made before the last word can be uttered on at least these three important questions, viz. the evidence in ancient writers upon the authorship of the book, the use of the Constitution by later writers, and the authorities followed in it.

Dr. Sandys accepts the Aristotelian authorship of the treatise, and is inclined to adopt the argument by which, in this *Journal* (XII, pp. 310 ff.), I

have attempted to show that Philochorus, in the generation following Aristotle, quoted the Constitution as Aristotle's. For this attitude of mind he has been taken to task by Mr. H. Richards in the *Classical Review* (VII, pp. 210 f.). Since Mr. Richards has slightly misapprehended my positions, it may not be out of place for me here briefly to restate the main propositions, referring the reader to the article for the fuller discussion. My "third argument" is the only one that really aims to prove that Philochorus cited Aristotle *by name*: the other two are introductory. It having been shown, in argument I, that Philochorus quoted by name many of his authorities, and, in argument II, that he had quoted from the Constitution, a presumption was established in favor of the proposition that, in citing the Constitution, he would have mentioned Aristotle's name if the work were Aristotle's. In argument III was pointed out what appeared to be a distinct case of such quotation by name. I there aimed to show that Aelian, or the authority from which he drew, had before him an extract from Philochorus concerning several events that took place before the battle of Salamis; that in this extract the name of Aristotle occurred as authority for a certain statement, which is found in the Constitution and is by Plutarch actually assigned to Aristotle. (This Philochorean extract lies at the bottom of Plut. Them. 10: Plutarch was in the habit of drawing from Philochorus.) Now, Aelian abridged the extract (N. H. XII 35), recording only one incident, but he gives as his authorities the names both of Philochorus, from whom he drew it, and of Aristotle mentioned in the fuller account, the latter's name for the purpose of lending greater credibility to his story. (Similar double but not independent citations of authorities are extremely frequent in the literature of the same class as Aelian's works: e. g. 'as Aristophanes and Didymus say'—in a scholium—does not mean that the scholiast has an independent knowledge of both Aristophanes's and Didymus's views on the subject in question, but that Didymus, whom he is transcribing in epitome, quotes Aristophanes as saying so and so.) In short, the presence of Aristotle's name in Aelian can be most reasonably explained on the hypothesis that Philochorus quoted from the Constitution and named Aristotle as the author. Other explanations are less satisfactory. It is not claimed that the argument amounts to an absolute demonstration, but only that it leads to what is to a very high degree probable.

Much of the originality of this edition lies in the readings and restorations proposed by the editor. It will be well, therefore, here to register the more characteristic of these readings, referring the reader to the English index for clues to many others suggested in the notes but rejected on the final choice. The readings in the text original with Dr. Sandys and here proposed for the first time are the following: Chapter 3, §2, line 6 (of the chapter) *αὐτὴ γὰρ ἐξ [ἀρχ]ῆς ἦν*. §3, 13 *ἀνταποδοθεῖσων τῶν ἀρχοντι δωρεῶν*. §5, 22 *ἀλλήλων. ᾤκησαν*.—C. 4, §2, 13 *ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τέλους παρασχομένους*. §3, 16 [*δί*] *ἐλθεῖν*.—C. 8, §4, 24 *τὴν πρόφασιν τοῦ πράττειν*.—C. 38, §1, 7 *ἐπεὶ στελλων*.—C. 45, §1, 3 *καὶ αὐθυμερόν*.—C. 54, §7, 32, 33 [*ἄθλα*] *δὲ πρόκειται [κατὰ τὰ ψη]φίσματα τὰ ἐπὶ Κηφισοφώντος ἀρχοντας*.—C. 57, §4, 25 *δικάζουσι [ἐν ἡλί]αι[α] καὶ ὑπαῖθριοι*.—Fragm. Col. 31, 1-3 τ[ῶ]ν δὲ [*κιβώτια ταῖς φυλ]αῖς [κατατίθενται]*] *πρόσθεν [τῶν ἀρχόντων κ]αθ' ἑκάστην τῇ[ν φν-] | λήν*. 27 *καὶ [π]ρο[δ]εῖξας αὐτῇ[ν ἀνέχ]ων τὸ γράμμα*.—Col. 32, 9 *ἐπιγράφει[ται πᾶσιν]*. 15, 16 *ταύτην τὴν ἀ[ρχήν, κα]τὰ [τ]ὴν τάξι*

ἀπο- | δοῦ]ς τὴν βακτηρίαν THC [τὸν] | [a]ῦ[τὸν] τρόπον. 19 οἱ δημοσίαι
[ὑπὲρ | τῇ]ς φυλῆς. But this list gives only an imperfect idea of the editor's
independence: the punctuation, the choice between readings proposed by
other scholars, as well as the editor's own suggestions, bear constant witness
to the soundness and the caution of his judgment.

Of course, in a book of the range of this edition it is inevitable that not a
few things should be said which cannot meet with entire assent. In what
follows I venture to submit some criticisms, corrections and comments suggested
by a rapid reading of the greater part of the book.

(1) Dr. Sandys more than once insists that Plutarch must have had a first-
hand acquaintance with the Constitution, and in support of his contention
appeals to instances of verbal coincidences of expression in Plutarch and
in the Constitution. But verbal coincidences are not sufficient to establish
such a claim. An abridgment of the Constitution would contain many of the
identical words and phrases of the original book. Now at c. 10 we have a
passage full of instruction on this whole matter. Aristotle writes, speaking of
the obscurity of Solon's laws, οἶονται μὲν οὖν τινὲς ἐπίτηδες ἀσαφεῖς αὐτὸν ποιῆσαι
τοὺς νόμους, ὅπως ἢ τῆς κρίσεως ὁ δῆμος κύριος. Plutarch, on the other hand
(Sol. 18), says λέγεται δὲ καὶ τοὺς νόμους ἀσαφέστερον γράψας κτλ. Plutarch here
has before him—or Plutarch's authority (Hermippus?)—not Aristotle, but rather
one of the writers (τινές) whose views Aristotle mentions to controvert (perhaps
Androton). If he had had before him the exact words of Aristotle, his sen-
tence could not have taken its present form. Not a few of the coincidences in
language between Plutarch and Aristotle may be explained on the supposition
of their drawing from the same historical writer, who at not a few points
appears to have been Androton. Bruno Keil has demonstrated this relation
and reference for the account of the *σεισάχθεια*, and Hude for the story of
Harmodius and Aristogeiton. Some of the radical inconsistencies of state-
ment in Plutarch's narrative and Aristotle's historical sketch might—it is
true—be explained, with Mr. Kenyon, on the theory that Plutarch took
abundant, but by no means complete, notes of his reading, and that when he
wove his notes into the texture of his narrative, he was led to make connecting
statements which were inconsistent with the full text of the original work.
That Plutarch took notes of his reading for future use is incontrovertible;
indeed, with the roll form of books, which made ready reference to a given
passage extremely irksome, and the verification of references a vast labor,
such a procedure is the only one conceivable. But the peculiar omissions of
highly important facts and the varied order in which subjects are brought up
seem to point to another explanation, at least for many of the phenomena.
Plutarch did not make his own abridgment of the Constitution, at least in his
life of Solon. Here he took his Aristotle at second-hand, doubtless through
Hermippus, whose life of Solon was one of his chief authorities, and through
Didymus. This view does not preclude the possibility of Plutarch's elsewhere
making a first-hand use of Aristotle, though in such places, to judge from
his literary habits, we should have expected him to give the name of an
authority so distinguished, whereas, in fact, he almost never names him.

(2) Dr. Sandys is disposed to reject the account of the Draconian constitu-
tion as an interpolation, herein following Headlam, Reinach and others. But,

at least so far as language and style are concerned, this c. 4 is of the same tissue as the remainder of the work, and the historical facts which it brings to our notice are not radically inconsistent with our other positive knowledge on the subject. The case for the rejection of this chapter has not yet been made out. The extraordinary similarity of the Draconian constitution to that proposed under the Four Hundred may quite as well be explained on the theory of a revival as on that of an anachronism. Everywhere in the closing years of the fifth century the oligarchic party in Athens was seeking to strengthen itself by a revival of the most ancient institutions. Probably, however, the account of the Draconian constitution, which Aristotle took as his source, was drawn up by some historical writer after the establishment of the constitution of the Four Hundred, and this fact may have led to a slight confusion, on the part of the historian, between the two forms, the ancient constitution and its revival, and to an incidental ascription, in some minor details, of features of the later constitution to the older one. But in its broad outlines the Aristotelian account of the Draconian constitution must be recognized both as historic and as part of the original treatise.

(3) If large interpolations must be found in the Constitution, I am surprised that no one has insisted that c. 12, containing the poetical extracts, should be suspected. It breaks the sequence of the narrative continued from the close of c. 11 on to c. 13: the *διὰ ταύτας τὰς αἰτίας* of c. 13 refers, not to the closing words of c. 12, but to those of c. 11. But we are not obliged to accept the theory of a late interpolation. The writer of the treatise may well have inserted the poetical extracts himself, as an after-thought, forgetting, however, to correct and adjust the *juncturae*.

(4) There is very little punctuation in the papyrus, but the slight indications that do exist might have been made more of. The *παράγραφος* is plainly evident at col. 1, under line 40, and at col. 8, under line 20. The former indicates that what we call c. 3 should have ended with the words *ἡ μὲν οὖν πρώτη πολιτεία ταύτην εἶχε τὴν ὑπογραφὴν*, which, accordingly, should not have been thrown into the next chapter. This division is significant for the purpose of dividing into paragraphs other passages in Aristotle where a like expression occurs. The highly ornate *παράγραφος* at col. 8, line 20, shows that a main division of the work closed at that point, viz. the history of the tyranny of Peisistratus and his sons. But none of the editors make even a chapter division at this point. These *παράγραφοι*, it is assumed, are a tradition from the manuscript from which our copy was made, being transcribed from it hastily, and not originally inserted by the scribe. This last fact appears from the *παράγραφος* at col. 2, under line 4, which was dashed in too soon by a line.

(5) Something can be said for an earlier date for the transcription of the papyrus than the third century A. D. I have elsewhere sought to show that the bailiff's accounts which stand on the *recto*, written A. D. 78-79, had not lost their value at the time the Constitution was copied (Proc. Am. Philol. Assoc. 1892, p. xxviii). Significant here is the blank back of the broad column 11—of which Dr. Sandys does not speak—so placed at the end of the first roll as to protect the accounts from injury when the roll is rolled up with the Aristotle within. This points to a date not far from 100 A. D., rather than to one a hundred or more years later.

(6) On p. liv Dr. Sandys gives a most ingenious argument, by which he shows that the lost initial portion of the Constitution did not amount to more than fifty lines: the argument is based in part on the quires apparently required by the leaves of the Berlin fragments.

(7) It is to be regretted that the editor has not cleared up the subject of the several classes of authorities to whom Aristotle refers, in his frequently recurring οἱ δημοτικοί, ἐνιοι, τινές κτλ.

(8) The Constitution really falls into three grand divisions (not into two), viz. 1. Sketch of constitutional history down to about 411 B. C., cc. 1-28; 2. Documentary account of the oligarchic revolutions and of the Restoration (411-403 B. C.), cc. 29-40, with c. 41, resumé of the previous historical survey; 3. Description of the body politic, cc. 42 ff.

(9) On c. 4, §1, 11 the *πρυτάνεις* are identified with archons; but if this be correct, and I believe that it is, what must Herodotus's *πρυτάνεις τῶν ναυκράρων* mean (VI 71)? Is not τῶν ναυκράρων here a gloss—of Herodotus's own making, to be sure? If, however, Dr. Sandys insists on rejecting c. 4 as a later interpolation, perhaps the fiction of some oligarchic sympathizer in the fifth century, he certainly cannot take *πρυτάνεις*, as here used without explanation or qualification, in any other sense than that current in the fifth and fourth century, 'members of the senate's presiding committee.'

(10) Possibly the following reading of the Diphilus inscription (c. 7, §4) may solve difficulties untouched by the other readings: Δίφιλος Ἀνθεμίωνος τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε θεοῖσι | θητικοῦ ἀντὶ τέλους ἰππᾶδ' ἀμειψάμενος. The faulty diaeresis after the third foot, though extremely rare, has its analogues on the stones (Allen, Greek Versification in Inscriptions, p. 56); in fact, in the cacophonous *σῶμα μὲν ἐνθάδ' ἔχει σόν, Δίφιλε, γαῖα θανόντος* (Allen, No. 57 = Kekulé, Theseion, n. 224), which partially resembles our first line, we have the name Diphilus. This reading makes it possible to retain the *Δίφιλον* in the introductory remark, and supplies an hexameter line, such as it is. That the text, however, as given in the papyrus, is an ancient corruption is apparent from Pollux, VIII 131.

(11) The dates of Peisistratus' life (c. 14) are discussed with much discernment. But two or three considerations, not weighed by Dr. Sandys, may be suggested. (a) In §4 the *μετὰ ταῦτα* in *ἔτει δὲ δωδεκάτῳ μετὰ ταῦτα*, by an idiom very frequent in the Constitution, may refer to *τὴν πρώτην κατάστασιν*, as Kaibel-Kießling take it (Harvard Studies, III, p. 68, note): this renders unnecessary any change in *δωδεκάτῳ*. (b) According to the Parian Marble, Peisistratus introduced tragedy into Athens in B. C. 536: hence, if we are to trust the Marble, this year cannot have been one of the years when he was in exile (so Kenyon, Köhler, Reinach?). (c) In Isocrates, XVI 25, a *στάσις* of forty years' standing is mentioned as existing between the Alcmeonidae and Peisistratus and his sons. Forty is, of course, a round number, but if we date back forty years from the final expulsion of the Peisistratidae (511-510 B. C.), we reach c. 550 for the final and irreconcilable breach between Megacles and Peisistratus, i. e. for the beginning of the second exile. Hence the second *τυραννίς*, which began c. 549 B. C. and was ended through the hostility of Megacles, must have been a brief one (Clinton, Busolt, Bauer), and not a long one (Poland, Kenyon, Reinach).

(12) The 'obelus' on col. 7, line 15, opposite *καὶ ὑβριστής*, appears to indicate a corruption in the text, perhaps the omission of some words that, if retained,

would have removed the contradiction between the statements of Aristotle and Thucydides as to the relation of Thessalus and Hipparchus to the troubles of the Peisistratidae. At all events, we are not obliged to accept Aristotle's text as perfectly sound on this point.

(13) Blass's and Hude's reading at c. 19, §4 ὅτι εὐπόρησαν χρημάτων <ἀποβλέποντες> is much to be preferred to ὅθεν. But ἀποβλέποντες, though provided for by the break, is not absolutely necessary for the same sense. The new reading makes the text conform to that of Herodotus, on which the context is based; it renders otiose Dr. Sandys's learned note on the passage.

(14) In c. 22, §8, read ὥρισαν τοῖς ὁστρακίζομένοις μὴ ἐντὸς Γεραιστοῦ κτλ. This gives the same sense as ἐκτός, is closer to the traditional text, and is in keeping with the quotation in Philochorus ap. Lex. Cantab. The hiatus after μὴ is not objectionable in a legal phrase; cf. c. 42, 8.

(15) At c. 24, §2, 1, in cancelling τε, the editor has removed an interesting anacoluthon, of which the papyrus gives several examples. Cf. c. 48, §4.

(16) In c. 43, §3, the retention of καὶ ὁ τι is more Aristotelian than the omission of it: ὅσα, at the beginning of the sentence, is not coincident in meaning with it: the warrant issued by the prytans shall cover the amount of matters to be taken up, the details for each day, and the time of the meeting.

(17) At c. 49, §3, Dr. Sandys takes παραδείγματα in the sense of 'architects' plans,' and does not note Diels's suggestion that the word means 'designs for the peplus' (Jahrb. d. deutschen Inst. 1891; Arch. Anz., p. 39). The context certainly favors the latter explanation, and it may be remarked that at c. 60, §1, we are told distinctly that it was in conference with the βουλή that the ἀθλοθέται τὸν πέπλον ποιοῦνται καὶ τοὺς ἀμφορεῖς ποιοῦνται. The designs both for the peplus and for the prize amphorae were originally to be proposed by the Athlothetae to the senate and executed with the consent of the latter body: at a later time, since jobbery had corrupted the decisions about the peplus, this matter was committed to a dicastery.

(18) Page 196, note: "In the fourth century, down to B. C. 322, we have 38 names, not one of them famous" (referring to γραμματεῖς of the senate). Certainly Aeschines might be regarded as one of the 'famous,' and there is little doubt that he was at one time secretary of the senate. Aristotle's language, however, applies the adjectives ἐνδοξότατοι καὶ πιστότατοι to men holding office in the period before c. 365 B. C.

(19) Attention might be called to the fact (c. 56, §3) that it was immediately on entering office that the archon selected the three choregi for the tragic contest. The Athenians wisely provided for a long period—midsummer to the following spring—in which actors and chorus might receive thorough training.

(20) At c. 57, §3, Dr. Sandys declares for δικάζουσι δ' οἱ λαχόντες ταῖς ἐθέταις. That such must have been the case in the earlier times cannot be denied, but there are grave difficulties in the way of those who maintain the continued existence and judicial activity of both the ἐφέται and the φιλοβασιλεῖς down to the close of the fourth century B. C. The whole subject of the interpretation of the so-called Amnesty Law of Solon (Plut. Sol. 19; cf. Andoc. Myst. 78), and the courts there mentioned, has by no means been fully cleared up.

(21) But for Dr. Sandys's suggestion (c. 57, §4) of *δικάζουσι*[*ν ἐν ἡλι*][*αι*][*α*] *καὶ ὑπαίθριοι* nothing except words of praise can be said. This restoration reconciles the language of Isocrates c. Callim. 52, 54, etc., with that of the tradition. The word *ἡλιαία* has here a double connotation, 'in the sunlight,' and, less directly, that of a heliastic court in general.

(22) It is hardly accurate to say that "many Panathenaic amphorae are found in . . . Greece" (on c. 59, §1). Is it not a fact that fewer are found there than elsewhere in the Hellenic world?

(23) From c. 60, §3, the inference may be drawn that the archon did not become a member of the Areopagus until after the expiration of his term of office. Perhaps this fact throws some light on the theory of Lange—now, however, for other reasons, hardly tenable—whereby the fifty-one ephetae and nine archons together made up the ancient court.

(24) The following misprints, or other minor faults, have caught my eye: P. xxxii, for 'nine' archons read 'ten.' P. 61, 17 read *ἐφώνησεν* in adn. cr. P. 65, 39, and elsewhere, *πρῶτος* is irregularly spelled. P. 79, 11, why not *συνέπιπτεν* without the []? P. 86, 19, adn. cr., read 39 (not 35). P. 150, 4 (col. 21, 7), the spelling *ΕΝΤΡΑΦΟΝΤΑΙ* is certainly worth citing alongside of the *ἐν Πειραιεῖ* of Demosthenes (Σ). P. lx, and often, 'Alcmeonidae' is the better spelling: the editor always corrects the traditional Munychion to Munichion. Mytilene is inconsistently spelled.

But all these criticisms and corrections, and others that might be suggested, are of very slight consequence when one considers the vast body of unimpeachably sound doctrine in the book. In his effort, to use the happy line of George Herbert quoted by him,

"to copie fair what Time hath blurr'd"

—after all one of the chief duties of the classical scholar—Dr. Sandys has been signally successful. It will be many years before his book can be superseded, and then only because advancing knowledge gives us new points of vision and appreciation, and throws all our old lore into a new perspective.

J. H. WRIGHT.

Der Vokalismus der oskischen Sprache, von CARL DARLING BUCK. Leipzig, K. F. Koehler's Antiquarium, 1892. xv + 219 pp.

Within the past two years the interest in the dialects of the Italic peninsula has been greatly stimulated by the appearance of several important works. Pauli, in the third volume of the *Alt-italische Forschungen*, has gathered together the inscriptions of the Veneti. More recently Krall, by the publication of the long inscription found in the wrappings of a mummy belonging to the Agram Museum, has furnished new material for the solution of the Etruscan problem. A Swiss scholar, Robert von Planta, has undertaken a grammar of the Oscan-Umbrian dialects, of which the first volume, treating the Lautlehre, in 600 pages, has appeared, while the second, which is to include also the entire body of inscriptions, is promised within a year. The same scholar, in *Indo-germanische Forschungen*, II, pp. 435-41, has recently published 'Eine dritte oskische Bleitafel,' which is only a fragment. More